

corroborative support to the **inspector's** belief that the cited area was loose. As noted, Desai testified that **drummy-sounding** roof is evidence of either a physical separation in the roof strata or loosened adhesion between the strata because of the presence of carnallite or mud **seams**. Desai also testified that carnallite poses the same hazard as does separation in the seams. Although **Amax** correctly contends that its operating experience must also be considered, we discern no persuasive reason on this record to challenge the **inspector's** informed judgment or to overturn the **judge's** finding that the roof was loose, 5/

5/ We reject any suggestion that the ground control measures required by the standard apply only when ground is in immediate danger of falling. The standard contains no such **qualification**. If an operator disagrees with an **inspector's** determination that the ground is loose, it can attempt to demonstrate the soundness of the ground by barring the area in question. Tr. 68. The operator also can point to the operating history of the mine and any other relevant factors tending to show that the ground is not loose. **Here, rather** than barring the area in question **Amax** installed additional roof bolts. However, as the facts of this case show the fact that roof bolts have previously been installed does not guarantee compliance with the standard. The **standard** requires not just support but adequate support.